Claims 131-200 are currently pending in the application. Claims 131, 148, 157, 167, 172, 177, and 180 are in independent form. The Listing of Claims herein replaces all prior amendments. No new claims are added.

In the Non-Final Office Action mailed December 17, 2010, the Examiner rejected Claims 131-147, 172-179 and 189-194 under 35 U.S.C §112 second paragraph for being indefinite.

Claims 131, 133-137, and 142-159, 161-185, 187-194 and 196-200 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolff (U.S. Pat. No. 6,738,841) in view of Larsson (U.S. Pat. No. 7,028,102).

Claims 132, 138-141,160, 186, and 195 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolff (U.S. Pat. No. 6,738,841) in view of Larsson (U.S. Pat. No. 7,028,102) and in further view of Eldridge (US 6,515,988).

The above amendments and these remarks are responsive to the Office Action of December, 17, 2010, reconsideration is requested.

In the above amendments, the title is changed, and a replacement Abstract is also provided. A "support for claim changes" is also included. At least each independent claim in the application has been amended. No new claims are added.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C § 112

Claims 131-147, 172-179 and 189-194 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 112, second paragraph for being indefinite. Specifically, Examiner noted that the mean plus function claims lack definite structure.

In this response, Applicant has amended the means for performing the claimed functions with corresponding structures, such as "by the one or more servers," "by the information apparatus," "by the server application," "by the client application;" or with analogous elements, such as "at the one or more servers" and "at the information apparatus." Accordingly, Applicant submits that the amended claims herein have overcome the U.S.C § 112, second paragraph rejection and thus respectfully requests withdrawal of the U.S.C § 112, second paragraph rejection.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 131, 133-137, and 142-159, 161-185, 187-194 and 196-200 are rejected as being unpatentable over Wolff (U.S. Pat. No. 6,738,841, thereafter Wolff) in view of Larsson (U.S. Pat. No. 7,028,102, thereafter Larsson).

Claims 132, 138-141,160, 186, and 195 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolff in view of Larsson and in further view of Eldridge (US 6,515,988 thereafter Eldridge).

1. Wolff

Wolff teaches a Printer 250, connected to a network that includes a Printer Server 255 internally inside the printer 250 (see Fig. 1). The Printer server 255 also includes Printer Driver 255 for generating print data. To print a document, a client 210 sends a request to the printer driver inside the printer 250. A server 220 that has the document provides the document to the printer driver 255 inside the printer 250 for

generating print data and for printing at the printer 250. For convenience, a passage from Wolff cited by the Examiner is reproduced below.

> *If a user requests, via client 210 or otherwise, that an HTML document be printed on printer 250, the user sends a request for the document to printer driver 255 within printer 250. Printer driver 255 obtains the document from a server 220 or 230 and renders it as it might appear on printer 250 (or a low-resolution version of the rendering) (Wolff, Column 6, lines 1-6).*

In the Office action, the Examiner cites Wolff as having taught each of the steps or elements in Claim 131 that includes the following:

"receiving by the one or more servers a document object from the information apparatus over a network…"

"receiving by the one or more servers an output device object from the information apparatus over a network, the output device object having one or more attributes corresponding to the output device…"

"generating device dependent output data at the server…."

"delivering the device dependent output data by the information apparatus to the output device for rendering the output content…"

In making the rejection, the Examiner cites the Printer Server 255 inside the printer 250 as being the "one or more servers" recited in Claim 131. Applicant respectfully disagrees for at least the following reasons.

1.1 The one or more servers is distinct and separate from … the output device

Applicant notes that Claim 131 recites "the one or more servers being distinct and separate from … the output device". In contrast, Wolff explicitly teaches the opposite to one of ordinary skill in the art that the Printer Server 255 must be included inside the printer 250 (see Fig. 1). Accordingly, because of the opposite teaching by Wolff, Applicant submits that Wolff is not an applicable reference for Claim 131 and analogously to all other claims.

Moreover, following Wolff, one of ordinary skill in the art will be led away from "the one or more servers being distinct and separate from … the output device" because Wolff explicitly teaches to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the printer server 255 inside the printer 250. Accordingly, Wolff cannot be combined with any other reference, including Larsson and Eldridge, to teach any of the steps or elements in Claim 131.

1.2 Transmitting, by the one or more servers, the generated device dependent output data to the information apparatus

Claim 131 has further been amended to recite "means for transmitting, by the one or more servers, the generated device dependent output data to the information apparatus for rendering of the output content at the output device".

Applicant notes that in Wolff, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the Printer server 255 inside Printer 250 does not send print data to client 210 for printing at the output device because Printer 250 internally has the print data generated by Printer server 255; hence, it just prints the document whether in low resolution or not

(Wolff, Column 6, lines 1-6). One of ordinary skill in the art will not be motivated to include "means for transmitting, by the one or more servers, the generated device dependent output data to the information apparatus for rendering of the output content at the output device" because of the explicit teachings of Wolff.

Applicant further notes that the server 220 in Wolff could not reasonably be interpreted by one of ordinary skill in the art to be the "one or more servers" recited in Claim 131 because server 220 does not teach nor suggest any one of the following elements recited in claim 131: "means for receiving a document object," "means for receiving an output device object," "means for generating device dependent output data," "means for transmitting…the generated device dependent output data to the information apparatus," and "means for delivering the device dependent output data by the information apparatus to the output device."

Accordingly, Wolff is not an applicable reference to claim 131, either alone or in combination with the other cited references.

2.   Additional Distinctions Added to Claim 131

In addition to the above, Claim 131 has been further amended to add clarity and to further distinguish from the cited references. Specifically, claim 131 has been amended to recite as follows:

> *means for generating the device dependent output data at the server with a server application, including:*
>
> *means for applying a compression operation on the output content, and*

*means for applying an encryption scheme for ensuring security
of the device dependent output data that is device specific for
rendering, and*

*the generated device dependent output data corresponding to
the output content being related, at least in part, to the identification
information related to the output device included in the output
device object and received from the information apparatus over the
network; and*

*means for transmitting, by the one or more servers, the generated
device dependent output data to the information apparatus for
rendering of the output content at the output device; and…*

Applicant submits that neither Wolff, Larsson, nor Eldridge teaches or suggests the combination of elements in the above that are recited in Claim 131. To cite just one example, neither Wolff, Larsson, nor Eldridge teaches or suggests means for applying a compression operation on the output content".

Applicant notes that Eldridge teaches encryption of document that is associated with a recipient or user (Column 2, line 64, Column 3, line 1-4); however, the encryption is not associated with "generating…device dependent output data that is device specific" for rendering.

Moreover, Eldridge does not teach "means for receiving, at the one or more servers, an output device object from the information apparatus over a network, the output device object having one or more attributes corresponding to the output device, and including identification information related to the output device." Accordingly, Eldridge could not further teach "means for applying an encryption scheme for ensuring security of the device dependent output data that is device specific for rendering" and

"the generated device dependent output data corresponding to the output content being related, at least in part, to the indication of identification information related to the output device included in the output device object and received from the information apparatus over the network".

Following the teachings of Eldridge, one of ordinary skill in the art would be led to encryption associated with the user to protect the user and not encryption associated with the output device.

3.   Other Claims

The other independent claims, namely claims 148, 157, 167, 172, 177, and 180, includes similar or analogous limitations to claim 131, therefore, applicant has not repeated the above arguments to facilitate reading of this Response. However, it shall become apparent from reading those claims that they distinguish from cited references, either alone or in combination. The dependent claims depend from independent claims 131, 148, 157, 167, 172, 177, and 180, and are thus allowable for the same reasons as those independent claims.

Conclusion

Applicant appreciates that the Examiner identified potential deficiencies in the application and the Applicant has corrected each of them accordingly. Applicant has further amended at least each independent claim to add clarity and to further emphasize the distinctions over the cited references.

Applicant hereby pays the fee for three months of extension for responding that is now due. Please charge any additional fees required, or credit any overpayments, to our deposit account number 11-1540.

Applicant believes that the above amendments overcome the rejections in the application, and that the application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner issue a Notice of Allowability covering the pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions, or if a telephone interview would in any way advance prosecution of the application, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned attorney of record as indicated below, at (503) 224-6655, or William Chang, Applicant and representative of the assignee of the entire interest in the application, at 503-381-7056.

Respectfully submitted,

KOLISCH HARTWELL, P.C.

_____ / Peter D. Sabido / _____
Peter D. Sabido
Reg. No. 50,353
Customer No. 23581
Attorney for Assignee
520 S.W. Yamhill Street, Suite 200
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: (503) 224-6655
Facsimile: (503) 295-6679